

Date: Mon, 11 Jan 93 04:30:14 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #11
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 11 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 11

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 10 Jan 1993 13:38:46 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!rpi!
newsserver.pixel.kodak.com!psinntp!psinntp!sugar!jreese@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan7.033238.29721@ke4zv.uucp>, <8376@lib.tmc.edu>,
<1993Jan8.020133.7915@ke4zv.uucp>odak.co
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <1993Jan8.020133.7915@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>Ok, since we're being silly, make it rule number one that anyone who
>even mentions a lawyer, much less hires one, never gets a coordination.

I'd vote for that one! :)

>If they don't like that, they can start their own coordination body
>and coordinate themselves. The FCC won't mind. They've refused to
>give exclusive recognition to any coordinating body.

...and the really interesting thing about this is that the Amateur Radio
Service is the only FCC regulated radio service which uses independent
frequency coordination groups NOT recognized by the FCC.

Unfortunately, the only ham radio organization which could do this is the ARRL, and they have steadfastly refused to become involved in the frequency coordinating process...but I could go on for hours about this one...

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans never refer to trouble
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | as deep doo-doo" --Molly Ivins

Date: Sun, 10 Jan 1993 13:32:11 GMT
From: usc!rpi!newsserver.pixel.kodak.com!psinntp!psinntp!sugar!
jreese@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan7.052814.461@ke4zv.uucp>, <8377@lib.tmc.edu>,
<1993Jan8.021432.8034@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <1993Jan8.021432.8034@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>Then they will lose. 97.101(b) is clear. The coordinator does not have
>the *authority* to grant exclusive use. In Georgia, such frivolous suits
>require the filer to pay all fees and costs, *and* double costs as damages.

Who says you need to sue for the frequency? There are many ways to sue someone. When the Texas VHF-FM Society was sued, it was for slander.

>Sure they screwed up. Such things happen, their database isn't well
>maintained and volunteer coordinators change regularly. Just because
>they made a mistake in their voluntary activities doesn't give me grounds
>to sue, however. I *could* file an interference complaint with the FCC
>against the link owner, but the FCC would just say "figure out a way to
>share." So I just cut to the chase and figured out a technical solution
>and saved myself a lot of pointless legal hassles.

That's because you are a reasonable person. The person who would sue a voluntary frequency coordination group is not reasonable. Unfortunately, being reasonable is not required to be a ham. :)

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans never refer to trouble
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | as deep doo-doo" --Molly Ivins

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #11
